

Commercial

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY
J. M. WHITNEY.

THE PACIFIC Commercial Advertiser.

Bitter-Sweet.

BY GEORGE R. PERKINS.

In the midnight-dreamed sleep, when the stars are slow and
Of the phantoms, and are paroled and were their tongues that
And their dimming eyes in spray implies the empty waste
Just for one delicious draught before the flood of death they
And their slumber on life of last that leaves their burning feet
Yet their lips half open its waters, for the stream is bitter-sweet.

In the barren waste of earth, that traverses all the scene of men,
Grows a faint apostrophe and quenchless, and the hour's despairing
And it drinks, but finds, Poor Quench, that the word is
Bitter-Sweet!

Honolulu, June 15, 1886.

REPORT

Of the Committee on Schools to the
Hawaiian Evangelical Association,
Adopted June 14, 1886.

The Committee appointed to prepare an expression of the sentiments of this Association, in regard to the Common Schools, have leave to report: That whereas the intellectual, moral and religious training of the youth of any people lies at the foundation of their prosperity, therefore we cannot do otherwise than feel a deep interest in whatever affects the schools for the Hawaiian youth. And while we have great reason to rejoice in what has been accomplished in the way of educating a nation so lately pagan, yet we have great reason to fear that during the past two years this cause has been retrograde.

It seems evident that those who have the direction of the schools are pursuing systematic measures to rid the schools of the influence and teachings of those who first taught the people to read and write. Hence

1. The former system of school laws was repealed by the Legislature two years ago, and the office of School Superintendent created, giving him exclusive power to select, appoint or remove all the teachers of all the schools.
2. The person first elected to fill this highly responsible office, and who continues to fill it, is A. Fernandez, Esq., who for a series of years, as editor of a public journal, had shown intense hostility to the American Mission and its doctrines, and great contempt for the system of schools they had inaugurated.
3. The wishes of the parents are utterly disregarded in the selection of men to instruct their children.
4. It is announced that all religious influences shall hereafter be excluded from the schools.
5. That soon the Bible will be dispensed as a school book.
6. The teaching of music is forbidden as a school exercise.
7. The Board of Education have assumed the exercise of ecclesiastical functions, and prescribed a form of prayer to be used by the teachers in the schools.
8. The distinction between Catholic and Protestant schools is ignored, and in many cases Catholic teachers are appointed over schools formerly taught by Protestants, and whose pupils were chiefly, if not entirely, of Protestant parentage.
9. The same also has been the result of the establishment of separate schools for boys and girls. Catholic teachers rapidly increase over Protestants where most or all the children are of Protestant parents.
10. Men, too, of immoral character have been appointed to the office of teacher and School Trustees.
11. A number of school houses have been sold in districts where there are enough children to sustain a school, as though it were intended that the children in those districts should henceforth grow up in ignorance.
12. The teachers are left without the help of a *haukula*, formerly chosen annually by the parents, to gather truant children to school, and as a consequence many children are left at home, and there is reason to fear they will gradually disappear.
13. As a general thing a uniform rate of wages (half a dollar a day) has been paid to the teachers, without regard to the amount of labor performed or the skill and fidelity of the teacher, and thus all stimuli to excel are thrown away, the school funds specially exhausted and the children turned loose to roam during long vacations.
14. In view of these things, and whereas a Committee of the Legislature have invited us to confer with them on the subject of schools, therefore

Resolved, That we appoint a Committee of our body to confer with them on the subject of schools, and to consider the same where the wishes of parents are disregarded in the selection of teachers, we advise them to take measures to establish schools on their own responsibility for their children.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

W. P. ALEXANDER,

T. COAN,

J. F. DODGE,

M. KALEA,

Committee on Schools.

COOLIE LABOR.—The subject of coolie labor, for the rice fields of the South, continues to attract considerable attention among the Southern and, indeed, the Northern press. The Norfolk *Virginian*, alluding to this subject, says:

"The malaria of the rice fields is fatal to the Caucasian, and no more certain death can be incurred than that which follows exposure on the great plantations of the *Peedee* and *Savannah* after dark. It is a matter of public record, and is so well known, that it is a disgrace, as well as a crime, that it can be made available for rice culture, and it will not be until the Orient has been made tributary to our necessities that this great stable can again be grown to any considerable extent. The coolies are the people who can do this work, who can stand the climate, who will do it, and gladly too, for a compensation far below that of half the crop, which, to them, would be the possession of Aladdin's lamp or a Roach's egg would have been to us—the realization of a fable—the substantiation of magic. They are insured to a burning sun; they are delicate and easily superstitious. Contracts could be made for their importation."

HAWAIIAN LEGISLATURE.

Forty-Tenth Day, June 14.

Assembly met at 11 A. M. Hon. G. Rhodes in the Chair. Prayer by the Chaplain. Minutes read and approved.

Mr. Kupaia read a bill to pay the Nobles of the Hawaiian Islands who, and the Legislative Assembly, the sum of \$150 for each session of the Legislature, which passed its first reading.

A resolution that the Sergeant-at-Arms be instructed to procure suitable conveyances for this body to attend the exhibition at Punaluani this evening was tabled.

H. H. W. C. Lunalilo introduced a resolution that the Sergeant-at-Arms go on board of the bark *Count* and order the Captain to fly his flag at half-mast, out of respect to the late Prince.

Hon. Mr. Dominis said that this House had no authority to issue such orders, and was in favor of tabled the resolution.

H. H. W. C. Lunalilo said that as an amendment he would put the word *advised*, in place of the word *order*.

Hon. Mr. Kawakulanihewa was in favor of the motion of His Excellency the Governor of Oahu.

Minister Hutchison said in favor of the remarks of the Governor of Oahu, and said that just as it is no to Capt. Paty would be all that was needed as he would then lower his flag immediately, as he was a good friend to this country, and would not be likely to offend to this country.

It was decided that it was an oversight, and that the word *advised* should be in place of *order*.

Hon. Mr. Kawakulanihewa gave notice of his intention to introduce a bill preventing the introduction of money and other valuables into the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. Kupaia introduced a resolution relating to the succession to the throne.

Mr. Ukeke spoke in favor of the same.

Minister Hutchison moved that the resolution be tabled, because the King was the one to appoint an heir to the throne, with the consent of the Nobles, but not of the Representatives. If tomorrow the King was to call his Cabinet together, and appoint an heir, and proclaim him as such, he would then be the heir apparent to the throne, but if anything should happen to His Majesty before he appointed such an heir, then the Legislative Assembly would be called and the heir chosen, and he could not see what this Assembly had to do with his heir to the throne, as things were so.

Hon. Mr. Ukeke advocated the resolution, as it was proper, and is only of such a nature as a reminder to His Majesty.

On motion leave was granted to withdraw the resolution.

Hon. Mr. Kakaia presented the following:

Resolved, that this Legislative Assembly express its Majesty through a committee their wish that he be married, so that his dynasty may be perpetuated.

Hon. Mr. Heuck moved that the rules be suspended in order to give the Committee to whom the bill was referred, a chance to report, as it would enlighten the minds of the Representatives on that matter.

Committee to whom was referred the resolution of the Hon. member Kupaia, who considered the resolution together with the expression of the feeling of the House upon the same, but that in their opinion one of the resolutions transmitted to the Hon. member Kupaia, was not in the nature of a bill, and was not of such a nature as to be introduced.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Kupaia, House proceeded to the order of the day, which was the Appropriation Bill.

On motion the consideration of the Appropriation Bill was postponed, in order that the House might take up some other matters.

Whole for the consideration of a bill, to indemnify the Minister of Finance.

Mr. Kawakulanihewa rose to make some remarks. Minister Varying said that he was, at the time the bill was introduced, in the House, and that he had been asked to introduce a bill, to indemnify the Minister of Finance, and if the member would listen to him, he would explain the transactions, which he hoped would be satisfactory to the members of the Assembly, and cause the bill to be passed.

Minister Hutchison said that the money was paid on under the law, but at the time it was expended it had not been put on the Appropriation Bill.

Mr. Kawakulanihewa said that he did not think it proper to introduce a bill, which was not well considered, because if this bill was not well considered, it would be initiating a step to allow the Ministers to spend what amounts they wished (or go into private speculations), and if sufficient evidence was not given to the House, the propriety of the bill would be voted against it.

Minister Harris said that he very much respected the remarks of the Hon. member Varying, as it was proper that these things should be explained to the House, and that the money was expended, it was not upon the Appropriation Bill, but it was upon the Appropriation Bill, and that the money was expended, it was not upon the Appropriation Bill, but it was upon the Appropriation Bill.

Minister Hutchison said that the money was paid on under the law, but at the time it was expended it had not been put on the Appropriation Bill.

Minister Varying said that the money was paid on under the law, but at the time it was expended it had not been put on the Appropriation Bill.

Minister Hutchison said that the money was paid on under the law, but at the time it was expended it had not been put on the Appropriation Bill.

Minister Varying said that the money was paid on under the law, but at the time it was expended it had not been put on the Appropriation Bill.

Minister Hutchison said that the money was paid on under the law, but at the time it was expended it had not been put on the Appropriation Bill.

Minister Varying said that the money was paid on under the law, but at the time it was expended it had not been put on the Appropriation Bill.

Minister Hutchison said that the money was paid on under the law, but at the time it was expended it had not been put on the Appropriation Bill.

Minister Varying said that the money was paid on under the law, but at the time it was expended it had not been put on the Appropriation Bill.

Minister Hutchison said that the money was paid on under the law, but at the time it was expended it had not been put on the Appropriation Bill.

Minister Varying said that the money was paid on under the law, but at the time it was expended it had not been put on the Appropriation Bill.

Minister Hutchison said that the money was paid on under the law, but at the time it was expended it had not been put on the Appropriation Bill.

Minister Varying said that the money was paid on under the law, but at the time it was expended it had not been put on the Appropriation Bill.

Minister Hutchison said that the money was paid on under the law, but at the time it was expended it had not been put on the Appropriation Bill.

Minister Varying said that the money was paid on under the law, but at the time it was expended it had not been put on the Appropriation Bill.

Minister Hutchison said that the money was paid on under the law, but at the time it was expended it had not been put on the Appropriation Bill.

Minister Varying said that the money was paid on under the law, but at the time it was expended it had not been put on the Appropriation Bill.

Minister Hutchison said that the money was paid on under the law, but at the time it was expended it had not been put on the Appropriation Bill.

Minister Varying said that the money was paid on under the law, but at the time it was expended it had not been put on the Appropriation Bill.

Minister Hutchison said that the money was paid on under the law, but at the time it was expended it had not been put on the Appropriation Bill.

Minister Varying said that the money was paid on under the law, but at the time it was expended it had not been put on the Appropriation Bill.

Minister Hutchison said that the money was paid on under the law, but at the time it was expended it had not been put on the Appropriation Bill.

Minister Varying said that the money was paid on under the law, but at the time it was expended it had not been put on the Appropriation Bill.

HONOLULU, HAWAIIAN ISLANDS, JUNE 23, 1886.

Forty-Sixth Day, June 15.

Assembly met at 11 A. M.

Hon. W. C. Lunalilo presented a report of Committee, to whom was referred the resolution regarding the sum of \$4,000 to Queen Dowager Kalama, and reported that the resolution was a proper one, and ought to pass, but that the \$2,000 received by her from the Crown Lands, should be included in this resolution. Report accepted.

Chairman of Committee on Internal Improvements, to whom was referred petition from Honolulu, to appropriate the sum of \$1,000 for harbor at Honolulu, and petition from Newellville for the sum of \$1,000 to build a wharf at that port, reported that they are needed and such amounts be placed in the Appropriation Bill when before the House. Report accepted.

On motion House proceeded to the order of the day, which was the bill to indemnify the Minister of Finance. Section 1 was read.

Mr. Kupaia moved to amend the bill, so that the words "and other government officers" be struck out of the bill, so that it should read Minister of Finance.

H. H. W. C. Lunalilo moved that the consideration of section 1 of the bill be indefinitely postponed.

Hon. Mr. Kakaia said that he was adverse to the passage of the bill, as it would appear outside of this House, that the Minister of Finance had done a wrong, and received indemnification from this House.

Hon. Mr. Ukeke said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Hutchison said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Varying said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Hutchison said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Varying said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Hutchison said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Varying said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Hutchison said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Varying said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Hutchison said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Varying said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Hutchison said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Varying said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Hutchison said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Varying said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Hutchison said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Varying said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Hutchison said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Varying said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Hutchison said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Varying said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Hutchison said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Varying said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Hutchison said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Varying said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Hutchison said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Varying said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Hutchison said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Varying said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Hutchison said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Varying said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Hutchison said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Varying said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Hutchison said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Varying said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Hutchison said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Varying said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Hutchison said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Varying said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Hutchison said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Varying said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Hutchison said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Varying said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

SIX DOLLARS PER ANNUM.
VOL. X. No. 50. WHOLE No. 526.

Minister Hutchison stated that the books regarding the Queen Dowager's income would soon arrive, and requested that action on the item be deferred.

On motion of His Highness W. C. Lunalilo, the will of His Majesty Kamehameha III. was read.

Minister Harris said that Queen Dowager Kalama had received from Her late Consort Kamehameha III. several lands in extension of her dower.

His Highness W. C. Lunalilo said that the Queen Dowager signed the agreement as to her dower before her will, and that it was several days before she made up her mind to sign it.

Mr. Hart said that if the Queen received the proceeds from these lands bestowed by her, as in the will of Kamehameha III., he did not see why this Assembly should appropriate any sums for her maintenance, as he thought she was well supported by her present income, and her present dower was from her own acts. He was in favor of tabling the report of the Committee.

Mr. Kupaia said that these lands were given to the Queen Dowager long ago, and in his opinion the will of her late husband was not like the original one which he had in his possession.

Mr. Kupaia said that these lands were given to her under a royal patent, he saw no reason why the House should not appropriate a sum in aid of her support, and moved that the report of the Committee be referred to a Select Committee, to inquire into all the circumstances.

Mr. Kakaia thought that the House would not be well informed as regards the late Queen Dowager Kalama, unless the books of the Interior Department were brought before the Assembly, and thought it was proper that the Mahalo Book be brought before the Assembly, in order to show whether she received these lands before the Mahalo Book.

Mr. Kupaia sympathized with the remarks of the last speaker.

On motion to refer the report of Committee to a Select Committee, put to vote and carried.

Five Department of Honolulu, \$5,000.

Mr. Kupaia moved the passage of the item as in the bill.

Mr. Kupaia moved to amend by striking out \$7,235, passed as amended.

Expense Government Printing, \$10,000.

Mr. Kupaia said that he would like to know how this \$10,000 was to be expended, and wanted to know why the sum was reduced to that amount.

Minister Hutchison thought that \$10,000 was sufficient, because it was a small sum, and he was in favor of all that was required.

Mr. Kupaia said that the native newspaper was badly conducted and was losing favor with the natives, he said very proper language is published in the paper, and informed the House that the Government papers cost \$20,000. There are two copies of each paper, one for the House, and one for the Interior Department, and what he wanted to know was how this \$20,000 was to be expended, and he wanted to know why the sum was reduced to that amount.

Minister Hutchison said that the House was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Varying said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Hutchison said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Varying said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Hutchison said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Varying said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Hutchison said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Varying said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Hutchison said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Varying said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.

Minister Hutchison said that he was in favor of the bill, and wanted to know whether the Minister of Finance was in the wrong, or not. If he was in the wrong, he should be indemnified, and if he was not in the wrong, he should not be indemnified.